

Appl. No. : 10/700,298
Filed : October 31, 2003

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on July 8, 2005, the Examiner allowed Claims 21-26 and 28-51 and objected to Claims 2-16, 18 and 27 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but noted that these claims were otherwise allowable. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17, 19 and 20. In the present Amendment and Response to Office Action, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 27. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and full consideration of the remarks contained herein.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that “the substrate temperature is less than the furnace body temperature of each of the one or more furnace bodies by about 20°C or more.” Support for this language can be found in the Application as originally filed. *See, e.g.*, the Application, pp. 9, 11-12 and 14-15, as originally filed. In addition, Claim 27 has been amended to indicate dependency from Claim 21, rather than Claim 18. Applicants submit that this merely corrects an obvious clerical error, as Claim 21, and not Claim 18, contains antecedent basis for claim terms in Claim 27. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims add no new matter and are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 21-26 and 28-51 are allowed and that dependent Claims 2-16, 18 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully decline to rewrite any of Claims 2-16, 18 or 27 in independent form at this time.

Applicants note, however, that dependent Claim 27 has been amended to depend from allowed Claim 21. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. : 10/700,298
Filed : October 31, 2003

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 17, 19 and 20 as being anticipated by Soininen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,679,951).

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended herewith, are patentably distinct.

Initially, Applicants note that amended Claim 1 recites “keeping the substrate adjacent to the boundary surface of each of the one or more furnace bodies during a heat-up time to allow the substrate to heat up to a substrate temperature, wherein the substrate temperature is less than the furnace body temperature of *each* of the one or more furnace bodies.” (emphasis added). Claim 1 further recites “subsequently removing the substrate from the reactor while the substrate temperature is *still less* than the furnace body temperature of *each* of the one or more furnace bodies.” (emphasis added). Thus, Claim 1 recites that the substrate is heated to a temperature which is *less* than the temperature of each of the furnace bodies and is removed from the reactor while it is *still less* than the temperature of each of the furnace bodies. As a result, in the recited heating and removal steps, the temperature of the substrate never exceeds the temperature of any of the furnace bodies.

In contrast, Soininen *et al.* teaches a process in which a substrate is heated to a temperature that exceeds the temperature of one of two furnace bodies. As noted by the Examiner, Soininen *et al.* discloses two furnace bodies, one at a relatively high temperature, *e.g.*, 285°C, and one at a relatively low temperature, *e.g.*, less than 65°C, to heat the substrate to a temperature intermediate between these two temperatures, *e.g.*, 250°C. See Soininen *et al.*, Col. 4, lines 35-40. Thus, Soininen *et al.* teaches heating the substrate to a temperature that is *higher* than one of the furnace bodies. Soininen *et al.* does not teach heating the substrate to a temperature that is “*less* than the furnace body temperature of *each* of the one or more furnace bodies” and “subsequently removing the substrate from the reactor while the substrate temperature is *still less* than the furnace body temperature of *each* of the one or more furnace bodies,” as recited by independent Claim 1. (emphasis added). Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Soininen *et al.* does not anticipate independent Claim 1, nor Claims 17, 19 and 20, which depend from independent Claim 1.

Appl. No. : 10/700,298
Filed : October 31, 2003

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the art of record. Applicants have not specifically addressed the further rejections of dependent claims as being moot in view of the amendments and remarks herein. However, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce in the Examiner's findings not addressed herein. Indeed, Applicants submit that the dependent claims recite further novel and non-obvious features of particular utility.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request entry of the amendments and submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same. If some issue remains which the Examiner feels may be addressed by Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 5, 2005

By: Adeel Syed Akhtar
Adeel S. Akhtar
Registration No. 41,394
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

1922364
090905